

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_74041
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of sustainability indicators for the breeding system
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This is an interesting article that deals with an interesting and pertinent topic nowadays. However, I feel some weakness in the article/mini-review. In the introduction, the authors must clearly state what the is the research purpose of it and why.</p> <p>In the literature review I advise the authors to make a clear reference to the Brutland report, as the concept of sustainable development was largely developed from here. This report is only rarely referred to and the concept presented here is not referred by the authors.</p> <p>The article makes no reference to the methodology. What databases were used? How was the literature review processed?</p> <p>The conclusions are poor and I believe they can be deepened.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Instead of sustainable use the term of sustainability. Correct all citations. Some of them are wrongly referred.	
Optional/General comments anaible	I also would to advise the authors to divide the literature review in two sections: one related with sustainable development and another to sustainable indicators.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria Lúcia Pato
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic Institute of Viseu, Portugal